

DNCT/EWA
Draft Meeting Minutes
8/10/99
9:30-12:30

Attendees: Mike Fris, Pete Chadwick, Pete Rhoads, Sheila Green, Paul Fujitani, Jim Snow, David Forkel, Art Hinojosa, Dave Fullerton, BJ Miller, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Dale Flowers, George Barnes

DNCT Action List:

1. Prepare Asset List - Dave Fullerton (8/19)
2. Prepare description of how we used assets - Mike Fris (8/19)
3. Prepare list of questions Negotiators may ask DNCT - BJ Miller (8/19)
4. Prepare list of games to run to provide information for negotiators - Dave Fullerton (co-chair), Bruce Herbold (co-chair), Jim Snow, George Barnes, Paul Fujitani, Russ Brown, (8/19)
5. Prepare list of real-time monitoring tools (deferred) - Pete Rhodes (chair), George Barnes, Peter Louie, Russ Brown, Paul Fujitani, Sheila Green, Jim White.

Outside Action List:

- Team to Formulate Policy Options: Need other people to formulate policy options that are relevant to decision making process. Somebody needs to sketch out and identify issues relating to how we get answers by November. Need to prioritize issues. Needs to be process oriented with facilitation. Address funding, governance, and organizational structure. Who and when? Describe how fits into overall process.
- What EWA needs to be: Policy to decide - side bar on negotiations box.

Agenda:

- 1) EWA Development Plan
- 2) DNCT Tasks and Schedule
- 3) Next Games

1) EWA Development Plan

- Development Team will design EWA for ROD.
- Team will do so by Thanksgiving.
- EWADT being put together this week

- EWADT will put together strawman.
- EWADT leader will guide development effort and team
- Assets feasibility team - will develop real assets
- Finish by XMAS.
- Need a list of what DNCT has to do by XMAS

Q: Why isn't this effort tied to ERP and CVPIA water management activities in chart. R: Coordination among those is a given. Will be in written descriptions - we can't put everything in chart - this is just the organization structure.

C: Org chart does not convey text - that is usually a problems. R: Will prepare additional functional chart.

C: Chart implies that EWA is all that is coming out of water management. R: Broader program - EWA is only an element. Linkage chart will show other elements (e.g., ERP).

C: Water users want integration not coordination of these water management elements.

Q: Should we add facilitation to negotiation process? R: Thinking about that.

Q: Where are the EWA issues being addressed? R: Leader will work on getting all issues addressed by appropriate groups.

Q: Can we make a list of all the decisions needed?

Q: Is it realistic for the EWA to hinge on B2 decisions? R: B2 will be up in the air through the whole period.

Q: What about White Paper Tech Teams of ERP? R: They have a different agenda and time frame.

C: Dealing with issues and prioritizing issues is tough.

C: A lot of the issues are Policy not technical.

Q: What should tech teams do in short-term (pre-Thanksgiving)?

C: Need to better define mission.

C: We won't get far on prioritizing actions - real-time response will be necessary based on available information at that time - can't prioritize now. Need to negotiate a basic set of assets and uses, then adjust at the time of need. We must allow exploring magnitude of assets and different rules for their use. We won't have the comfort that they will be based on sound science.

R: We need to prepare guidance from the DNCT to the EWADT team.

C: How encompassing is the EWA going to be? Is the In-Delta B2 separate? These have enormous implications. R: These are policy not tech team issues. These will be different accounts under one water management system.

C: Long-term - tech teams will be evaluating effectiveness of actions. Short-term - not sure it is a tech team function.

- C: Not sure we have to define EWA priorities - just put pie together. Use it in future based on information at that time - crawl before you walk.
- C: The setup process will drag in other issues. Dispute will arise. Requests will come to DNCT for tech info. We will provide information on demand to negotiators that is different from the long-term process of tech issues resolution. The white paper tech teams will not help the negotiations process. DNCT will support on on-call basis.
- C: We should define how we employ each asset.
- C: We know certain things about how each asset works. Lets define each asset and how they work in detail. R: Yes, this will be action item #1.
- C: Negotiations will bog down on how they are used - when it is not necessary to resolve that now - we simply need to provide opportunities to try them out in Stage 1.
- C: We need to take a pro-active approach to analyses - start before negotiators ask the questions. Better than being reactive. Start tech analysis now.
- C: We can use gaming to help the process prepare in advance - for example we can game 800 TAF of CVPIA water as an EWA asset.
- C: Assets - Cost - Money Pot: how to match assets with the money - need info on cost/benefit of assets (e.g., Kern Water Bank).
- C: Need to put ourselves in negotiators shoes.
- Q: Are we admitting that we don't know the outcome of our actions? R: there will be some uncertainties and differing conditions from year to year.
- Q: How will integration be different from coordination? R: Integration implies a single decision making focus.
- Q: How many assets? R: We do not know the level needed as yet.
- C: We should try to define questions they will ask us. R: make that a action item.
- C: Really three types of actions: 1) coordinate tech work; 2) formulate policy options; and 3) supporting negotiators
- Q: Do tools include monitoring and modeling? R: Yes.
- S: Assuming we are asset limited we should do the following:
- ▶ develop brutally realistic baseline assets
 - ▶ start with these baseline assets then define range of operations with these assets - could have b(2) in baseline or not - will help us define tools needed.
- C: We have discretion in many areas which helps.
- C: There is value in determining what is best combination of assets to maximize benefits to all parties.

- S: Combine 3, 4, and 7 - develop games to max, including consideration of baselines, and sharing tools.
- S: There are a multitude of baselines, assets, etc. Need to decide on a baseline. Otherwise there are too many combinations to analyze. We should get it down to two.
- S: Combine 4 and 7 - Need to develop set of games to maximize information that is relevant to EWA including baseline assets and sharing. Conduct sensitivity analysis to determine consequences of baseline assets, sharing formula, under different baselines.
- C: Challenge in designing new games.
- C: Gaming need not be so inefficient.
- C: Gaming provides insights not provided by DWRSIM.
- C: There are two types of monitoring: to guide operations and for ERP.
- S: New #5 - work with CMARP on biological and physical monitoring and data collection requirements to support EWA operations. R: Does not apply to our need to support negotiations.
- S: Combine 5 and 8.
- C: Task list is not all negotiating items.
- C: Combine 5 and 6.
- S: We should put together a small group to define model

2) DNCT Tasks and Schedule

- S: Start with a base of EWA assets at beginning and end of Stage 1. These should be physical assets. We would be asset limited. Will have to struggle to get assets developed. Other things will be controversial. We should start doing analyses of these base cases. We should develop sharing formulas.
- C: These should be included in Dave's Task 1. But don't confine it to that. B2 should be among assets.
- C: We should ground ourselves with realism as there are many options available - too many degrees of freedom.
- Q: Don't we want a comprehensive list out of Task 1? R: We don't want to lock in operations.
- C: It will depend on what the fish are doing.
- S: We should try different runs with different baselines. Play off with baseline of assets.
- Q: Is this the strawman? R: Physical assets only. It is a step toward a strawman. It should be non-controversial with a lot of support.
- Q: If we decide full Banks, how will it affect decision on EWA? R: It will force a decision and provide feedback to CALFED.

Q: Potential use of assets versus priority of assets? R: Got put in potential uses of assets as well as other sections.

Q: How do we balance priorities? R: Mission of EWA has to include priorities.

C: Biol will be last of info used to determine priorities.

Q: Who has the job of determining priorities? R: Policy - a least up front.

C: Priority is #1 and #2, followed by #4.

Next Meeting - August 19th

Group 4 will meet next Tues 9:30-12:30.

DNCT meeting Thursday, 19th to review results of committees

Following Gaming